

AMENDMENTS to the DRAWINGS

No amendments or changes to the Drawings are proposed.

REMARKS

Reconsideration and Interview

We appreciate the Examiner's time and suggestions made during the telephone interview, and we appreciate the Examiner's withdrawal of the objections to the specification, objection to Claim 19, rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, and rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Patel in view of Sanchez.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With respect to the rejections of claims 8 - 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over previously-cited Patel and Sanchez in further view of newly-cited Stevens, we respectfully disagree with the Examiner's conclusions and traverse each ground of rejection.

For brevity of the examination record, we respectfully incorporate herein our arguments regarding the teachings of the Patel and Sanchez references from our previous reply(ies).

Claims 8, 12 and 13

With respect to the Stevens reference, we respectfully disagree that Stevens teaches our claimed steps, elements and limitations regarding converting an attribute value from a first non-LDAP-compatible format to a second LDAP-compatible format. Stevens is directed towards policy servers. "Network access policy" is a set of rules and guidelines dictating how and when each networked device may access a directory, including Quality of Service, authentication, etc. (Stevens col. 3, lines 15 - 23). Please see extrinsic documents by Thayer and WhatIs.com attached herewith via supplemental Information Disclosure Statement.

Such network access policies would not contain "real time values", because such policies are relatively stable and static in nature. "Real time values" refer to values which change rapidly over time, such as stock tickers, or instantaneous measurement of bandwidth usage.

Stevens discloses storing network access policy *within an LDAP directory* (col. 2, line 22 - 24). But, Stevens is silent regarding retrieving a real-time value from outside an LDAP directory, converting it to LDAP protocol format from another non-compatible format, and then returning that converted value to a requester *without storing it in the LDAP directory*.

We believe the cited passages of Stevens refer only to *network access policies* being stored in a directory and communicated in an LDAP protocol, but are silent regarding retrieving *real-time values* as we have claimed (our emphasis added):

From Stevens' column 10:

Special note should be taken of the existence of both an illustrative external LDAP client 540-(N-1) and illustrative LDAP server 540-N. While other external client/server pairs 540-j (with associated internal header processors 530-j) for other particular communications protocols will in general be used in network devices 500-I, use of the LDAP pair simplifies the following discussion. Information exchanged between external clients/servers 540-j and network device 500-I is advantageously processed in the schema adaptation layer 520 in device 500-I.

From Steven's Claim 38:

20. In a data network having a plurality of selectively interconnected network devices, a first network device comprising means for storing values for configuration attributes and state attributes for said first network device, means for associating function values for at least one function of selected state attribute values with at least one network policy application, means for selectively **notifying at least one of said network policy applications** of an event reflected by an associated function value, and **means for receiving policy information** through a standard input interface at said first network device from at least one network policy application.

...

38. The network device of claim 20 wherein said **means for receiving policy information** through a standard input interface comprises means for recognizing the one of a known plurality of protocols employed to send policy information to said first network device, means for **converting policy information** received using said one of said plurality of protocols into control information specific to said first network device, and means for modifying said configuration attributes in response to said control information.

Column 10 is silent regarding converting or suppressing – it only discloses use of an LDAP protocol in general.

We believe that one ordinarily skilled in the art would not consider communication and conversion of *policy information* to be the same as converting *real-time attribute values* from non-LDAP to LDAP format and communicating the *converted real-time values*.

We also respectfully submit that precisely because Stevens' policy information is specifically disclosed as being stored *in an LDAP directory*, Stevens therefore is silent regarding *avoiding storing* converted real-time values *in an LDAP directory*.

For these reasons, we request allowance of Claims 8, 12 and 13.

New Claims 20 - 23, 27, and 28

These claims are drawn to computer readable memories and systems corresponding to the method claims 18, 12 and 13. For the same reasons, we request allowance of these claims.

New Claims 24 - 26

These claims present system claims drawn to circuit implementations of our invention, which Patel, Sanchez and Stevens fail to teach. We respectfully request allowance of these claims.

Ordinary Skill Level

We respectfully repeat our request for an explicit determination by the Examiner of what is being considered to have been the ordinary skill level in the relevant art(s) at the time of our invention, and that analysis be placed into the record of examination.

Request for Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

We believe we have responded to all grounds of rejection and objection, but if the Examiner disagrees, we would appreciate the opportunity to supplement our reply.

We believe the present amendment places the claims in condition for allowance. If, for any reason, it is believed that the claims are not in a condition for allowance, we respectfully request constructive recommendations per MPEP 707.07(j) II which would place the claims in condition for allowance without need for further proceedings. We will respond promptly to any Examiner-initiated interviews or to consider any proposed examiner amendments.

Respectfully,

/ Robert Frantz /

Robert H. Frantz, Reg. No. 42,553
Agent for Applicant
Tel: (405) 812-5613
Franklin Gray Patents, LLC